

## BOARD OF REVIEW DECISION

**Title of publication:** 37638-0 181597\_1.1.E01\Acer (NTFS, 6)\Users\Roger\Pictures\2011-12-26 December 2011\Thumbs.db\256\_49209994a482d8f8.jpg

**Other known title(s):** Not stated

**OFLC ref:** 1900147.003

**Medium:** Image File

**Maker:** Not stated

**Country of origin:** Aotearoa New Zealand

**Language:** Not applicable

**Applicant:** Roger Beanland

<b>Classification:</b>	Objectionable.
------------------------	----------------

**Descriptive note:** None

**Display conditions:** None

**Date of entry in Register:** 12 November 2019

**Date of direction to issue a label:** No direction to issue a label has been issued

**Date of notice of decision:** 08 November 2019

### Summary of reasons for decision:

This was an application made to the Board under section 47(2)(c) of the Films, Videos and Publications Classification Act 1993 (the Act) for a review of the decision of the Office of Film and Literature Classification (the Classification Office) dated 4 July 2019.

The publications subject to this review are seven individual images, three of which are a set apparently taken in the same place within a short space of time, and the other four of which are similarly taken in the same place as each other within a short space of time (being a different time and place from the first set) (together, “the images”). Each of the images was considered separately by the Board.

In its decision, the Classification Office classified each of the images as objectionable under the Act. The applicant sought a review of that decision.

After reading submissions from the applicant, the Classification Office and the New Zealand Police, and reviewing the images, the Board has determined that each of the images should be classified as objectionable under the Act.

A majority of the Board deemed each of the images as objectionable under section 3(2)

because they supported the sexual exploitation of children.

In addition, the Board unanimously determined each of the images to be objectionable because they describe, depict, express or otherwise deal with sex in such a manner that its availability is likely to be injurious to the public good (section 3(1), applying the factors set out in section 3(3) and 3(4)).